arXiv:1609.06962v1 [math.AP] 22 Sep 2016

On the Liouville type theorems for self-similar solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations

Dongho Chae* and Jörg Wolf †

∗Department of Mathematics
Chung-Ang University
Seoul 156-756, Republic of Korea
e-mail: dchae@cau.ac.kr
and
†Department of Mathematics
Humboldt University Berlin
Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: jwolf@math.hu-berlin.de

Abstract

We prove Liouville type theorems for the self-similar solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. One of our results generalizes the previous ones by Nečas-Růžička-Šverak and Tsai. Using the Liouville type theorem we also remove a scenario of asymtotically self-similar blow-up for the Navier-Stokes equations with the profile belonging to $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $p > \frac{3}{2}$.

AMS Subject Classification Number: 35Q30, 76D03, 76D05
keywords: Navier-Stokes equations, self-similar solution, Liouville's theorem

1 Introduction

We consider the Navier-Stokes equation in the space time cylinder $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-T, 0)$

$$\partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \Delta u = -\nabla p, \qquad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $u = (u_1(x,t), u_2(x,t), u_3(x,t))$, $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-T, 0)$. The aim of the present paper is to exclude a possible self similar blow up at the point $(0,0)$ under more general assumptions than in [8]. More precisely, we assume that u and p respectively are given by a self similar profiles $U : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and $P : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-2at}} U\Big(\frac{x}{\sqrt{-2at}}\Big), \tag{1.2}$$

$$p(x,t) = \frac{1}{-2at} P\Big(\frac{x}{\sqrt{-2at}}\Big), \quad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-T, 0), \tag{1.3}$$

where a is a positive constant. Then (U, P) solves the following system proposed by Leray (cf. [6]).

$$-\Delta U + (U \cdot \nabla)U + ay \cdot \nabla U + aU = -\nabla P, \qquad \nabla \cdot U = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{1.4}$$

It is already known that if $U \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for some $p \in [3, +\infty]$, then $U = 0$ for $p \in [3, \infty)$, while $U = \text{const}$ for $p = \infty$. The case $p = 3$ is proved in [7], while the case $p > 3$ has been proved by Tsai in [8]. In fact Tsai proved a more general result, namely that $U = 0$ if u satisfies a the local energy bound

$$\sup_{t \in (-t_0, 0)} \int_B |u(t)|^2 dx + \int_{-t_0}^{0} \int_B |\nabla u|^2 dx dt < +\infty \tag{1.5}$$

for some ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and some $t_0 > 0$.

We extend the results mentioned above in different directions. Our first main result is the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(U, P) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)^3 \times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a solution to (1.4), and $\Omega = \nabla \times U$. Suppose that for some $q > 0$*

$$\|U\|_{L^q(B_1(y_0))} + \|\Omega\|_{L^2(B_1(y_0))} = o(|y_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \text{as} \quad |y_0| \to +\infty. \tag{1.6}$$

Then, U is a constant function.

Below we remove the condition on Ω, and instead we restrict the range of q so that $q > \frac{3}{2}$. Our second main result is the following

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(U, P) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)^3 \times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a solution to (1.4). Suppose that for some $\frac{3}{2} < q < +\infty$ and $\alpha > 0$*

$$\int_{B_1(y_0) \cap \{|U| > \alpha\}} |U|^q dx \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |y_0| \to +\infty. \tag{1.7}$$

Then U is a constant function.

Remark 1.3. If $U \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, then (1.7) is obviously satisfied with the choice of $\alpha = \|U\|_{L^\infty} + 1$. In general, if $U \in L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $p > q$ implies (1.7). Indeed, for $\frac{q}{p} < \theta < 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_1(y_0) \cap \{|U| > \alpha\}} |U|^q dx &= q \int_\alpha^\infty \sigma^{q-1} \,\text{meas}\{B_1(y_0) \cap |U| > \sigma\} d\sigma \\
&\le q \|U\|_{L^{p,\infty}}^{p\theta} \,\text{meas}\{B_1(y_0) \cap |U| > \alpha\}^{1-\theta} \int_\alpha^\infty \sigma^{q-p\theta-1} d\sigma \\
&= q \|U\|_{L^{p,\infty}}^{p\theta} \,\text{meas}\{B_1(y_0) \cap |U| > \alpha\}^{1-\theta} \frac{\alpha^{q-p\theta}}{p\theta - q} \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $|y_0| \to +\infty$. Thus, Theorem 1.2 leads to the following Corollary

Corollary 1.4. *Let $(U,P)\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)^3\times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a solution to (1.4). Suppose that for some $\frac{3}{2}<p<+\infty$*

$$U\in L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{1.8}$$

The above corollary shows clearly that Theorem 1.2 improves the previous results of [7, 8]. As an application the above result one can remove a scenario of asymptotically self-similar blow-up with a profile given by (1.8) as follows, which could viewed as an improvement of the corresponding result in [2].

Theorem 1.5. *Let $u\in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3\times(0,t_*))$ be a solution to (1.1). Suppose there exists U satisfying (1.8) with $\frac{3}{2}<p<+\infty$, and $q\geq 2$ such that*

$$\lim_{t\nearrow t_*}(t_*-t)^{\frac{q-3}{2q}}\sup_{t<\tau<t_*}\left\|u(\cdot,\tau)-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2a(t_*-\tau)}}U\left(\frac{\cdot-x_*}{\sqrt{2a(t_*-\tau)}}\right)\right\|_{L^q(B_{r\sqrt{t_*-t}}(x_*))}=0 \tag{1.9}$$

for all $r>0$. Then, $U=0$, and $z_*=(x_*,t_*)$ is not a blow-up point.

2 Local L^∞ estimate for local suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation without pressure

The aim of the present section is to provide a local L^∞ bound for local suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations without pressure.

First, let us recall the notion of the local pressure projection $E_G^*:W_G^{-1,s}\to W^{-1,s}(G)$ for a given bounded C^2-domain $G\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\in\mathbb{R}^n$, introduced in [11]. Appealing to the L^p-theory of the steady Stokes system (cf. [3]), for any $F\in W_G^{-1,s}$ there exists a unique pair $(v,p)\in W^{1,s}_{0,\sigma}(G)\times L^s_0(G)$ which solves in the weak sense the steady Stokes system

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\cdot v=0\quad\text{in}\quad G,\quad -\Delta v+\nabla p=F\quad\text{in}\quad G,\\ v=0\ \text{on}\quad\partial G.\end{aligned}$$

Then we set $E_G^*(F):=\nabla p$, where ∇p denotes the gradient functional in $W^{-1,s}(G)$ defined by

$$\langle\nabla p,\varphi\rangle=\int_G p\nabla\cdot\varphi dx,\quad \varphi\in W_0^{1,s'}(G).$$

Here we have denoted by $L^s_0(G)$ the space of all $f\in L^s(G)$ with $\int_G f dx=0$.

Remark 2.1. 1. The operator E_G^* is bounded from $W^{-1,s}(G)$ into itself with $E_G^*(\nabla p)=\nabla p$ for all $p\in L^s_0(G)$. The norm of E_G^* depends only on s and the geometric properties of G, and independent on G, if G is a ball or an annulus, which is due to the scaling properties of the Stokes equation.

2. In case $F \in L^s(G)$ using the canonical embedding $L^s(G) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,s}(G)$ and the elliptic regularity we get $E^*_G(F) = \nabla p \in L^s(G)$ together with the estimate

$$\|\nabla p\|_{s,G} \le c\|F\|_{s,G}, \tag{2.1}$$

where the constant in (2.1) depends only on s and G. In case G is a ball or an annulus this constant depends only on s (cf. [3] for more details). Accordingly the restriction of E^*_G to the Lebesgue space $L^s(G)$ defines a projection in $L^s(G)$. This projection will be denoted still by E^*_G.

Below for a class of vector fields X we denote by X_σ the set of $u \in X$ such that $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ in the sense of distribution.

By using the projection E^*_G, we introduce the following notion of local suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations

Definition 2.2 (Local suitable weak solution)**.** Let $Q = \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-T, 0)$. A vector function $u \in L^2_{loc}(Q)$ is called a *local suitable weak solution to* (1.1), if

1. $u \in L^\infty_{loc}(-T, 0; L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(-T, 0; W^{1,2}_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3))$.
2. u is a distributional solution to (1.1), i. e. for every $\varphi \in C^\infty_{\rm c}(Q)$ with $\nabla \cdot u = 0$

$$\iint\limits_Q -u \cdot \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} - u \otimes u : \nabla\varphi + \nabla u : \nabla\varphi dxdt = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

3. For every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ the following local energy inequality *without pressure* holds for every nonnegative $\phi \in C^\infty_{\rm c}(B \times (0, +\infty))$, and for almost every $t \in (-T, 0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int\limits_B |v_B(t)|^2\phi dx + \int\limits_{-T}^{t}\int\limits_B |\nabla v_B|^2\phi dxds \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_{-T}^{t}\int\limits_B |v_B|^2\Big(\Delta + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)\phi + |v_B|^2 u \cdot \nabla\phi)dxds \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_{-T}^{t}\int\limits_B (u \otimes v_B) : \nabla^2 p_{h,B}\phi dxdt + \int\limits_{-T}^{t}\int\limits_G p_{1,B} v_B \cdot \nabla\phi dxds \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int\limits_{-T}^{t}\int\limits_G p_{2,B} v_B \cdot \nabla\phi dxds,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where $v_B = u + \nabla p_{h,B}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla p_{h,B} = -E^*_B(u), \\
&\nabla p_{1,B} = -E^*_B((u \cdot \nabla)u), \quad \nabla p_{2,B} = E^*_B(\Delta u).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.3. 1. Note that due to $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ the pressure $p_{h,B}$ is harmonic, and thus smooth in x. Furthermore, as it has been proved in [11] the pressure gradient $\nabla p_{h,B}$ is continuous in $B \times (-T, 0)$.

2. The notion of local suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying the local energy inequality (2.3) has been introduced in [10]. As it has been shown there such solutions enjoy the same partial regularity as the standard suitable weak solution as proved in the paper by Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg[1]. Furthermore, the following ε-regularity criterion has been proved for solution satisfying (2.3):

There exists and absolute number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if for any $Q_r = B_r(x_0) \times (t_0, t_0 - r^2)$ it holds

$$r^{-2} \iint\limits_{Q_r} |u|^3 dxdt \le \varepsilon^3 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad u \in L^\infty(Q_{r/2})$$

(cf. also [10]).

Before turning to the statement of this result we will fix the notations used throughout this section For $z_0 = (x_0, t_0) \in Q$ and $0 < r < \sqrt{-t_0}$ we define the parabolic cylinders

$$Q_r = Q_r(z_0) = B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0), \quad I_r = I_r(t_0) = (t_0 - r^2, t_0).$$

By $V^2_\sigma(Q_r)$ we denote the space $L^\infty(I_r; L^2(B_r)) \cap L^2(I_r; W^{1,2}_\sigma(B_r))$. Furthermore for $u \in V^2(Q_r(z_0))$ we set

$$A_q(r, z_0) = \left(r^{q-3} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t \in I_r(t_0)} \int\limits_{B_r(x_0)} |u(x,t)|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad G(r, z_0) = r^{-1} \int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dxdt,$$

$$E_q(r, z_0) = r^{-\frac{3+q}{3q}} \left(\int\limits_{I_r(t_0)} \left(\int\limits_{B_r(x_0)} |u|^q dx \right)^{\frac{3}{2q-3}} dt \right)^{\frac{2q-3}{3q}}.$$

Remark 2.4. According to Lemma 4.1[10] the following Caccioppoli-type inequality holds true

$$G\Big(\frac{r}{2}, z_0\Big) \le C\Big(E_3(r, z_0)^2 + E_3(r, z_0)^3\Big), \tag{2.4}$$

where $C > 0$ denotes an absolute constant.

Our main result of this section is the following ε-regularity criterion

Theorem 2.5. *Let $u \in V^2_\sigma(Q)$ be a local suitable weak solution to (1.1). Let $\frac{3}{2} < q \le 3$. There exist two positive constants ε_q and C_q, both depending on q only, such that if for $Q_r(z_0) \subset Q$, $z_0 = (x_0, t_0)$, the condition*

$$A_q(r, z_0) \le \varepsilon_q. \tag{2.5}$$

implies $u \in L^\infty(Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(z_0))$*, and it holds*

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(z_0)} |u| \le C_q r^{-1} A_q(r, z_0). \tag{2.6}$$

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 2.5 we provide some lemmas, which will be used in our discussion below. We begin with a Caccioppoli-type inequlities similar to (2.4).

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $u \in V^2_\sigma(Q_R)$ *be local suitable weak solution to* (1.1)*. Then for every* $\frac{3}{2} < q \le 3$

$$E_3\Big(\frac{3}{4}R\Big)^2 + G\Big(\frac{3}{4}R\Big) \le C\Big(E_q(R)^2 + E_q(R)^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}\Big) \le C\Big(A_q(R)^2 + A_q(R)^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}\Big), \tag{2.7}$$

where $C > 0$ *denotes a constant depending only on* q*.*

Proof: Let $0 < r < \rho \le R$ be fixed. Set $B = B_\rho$, and define $v_B = u + \nabla p_{h,B}$, where $\nabla p_{h,B} = -E^*_B(u)$. Let ϕ denote a suitable cut off function for $Q_r \subset Q_\rho$. As it has been proved in [10] (cf. estimate (4.4) therein), applying Hölder's inequality, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\phi v_B\|^2_{L^\infty(I_\rho;L^2(B_\rho))} + \|\phi \nabla v_B\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \\
&\quad \le c\rho(\rho - r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{9}{4}}(B_\rho))} + (\rho - r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + \frac{1}{4}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \\
&\quad \le c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho - r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + (\rho - r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + \frac{1}{4}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

By means of Sobolev's inequality together with Hölder's inequality, (2.1) and (2.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi v_B\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho))} &\le \|\phi v_B\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^\infty(I_\rho;L^2(B_\rho))}\|\phi v_B\|^{\frac{2}{3}}_{L^2(I_\rho;L^6(B_\rho))} \\
&\le \|\phi v_B\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^\infty(I_\rho;L^2(B_\rho))}(\|v_B \cdot \nabla\phi\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)} + \|\phi\nabla v_B\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)})^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\le \|\phi v_B\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^\infty(I_\rho;L^2(B_\rho))}\Big((\rho - r)^{-1}\|v_B\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)} + \|\phi\nabla v_B\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)}\Big)^2 \\
&\le c\|\phi v_B\|^2_{L^\infty(I_\rho;L^2(B_\rho))} + (\rho - r)^{-2}\|v_B\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} + \frac{1}{16}\|\phi\nabla v_B\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \\
&\le c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho - r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + (\rho - r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + \frac{1}{16}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

We recall the following Caccioppoli inequality for a harmonic function

$$\int_{B_\rho} \phi^2 |\nabla h|^2 dx \le \max_{B_\rho} |\Delta\phi| \int_{B_\rho} |h|^2 dx,$$

which will be repeatedly used below. The proof is immediate from the formula $-\Delta h^2 + 2|\nabla h|^2 = 0$, by multiplying ϕ, integrating over B_ρ, and then using integration by part.

Recalling that $p_{h,B}$ is harmonic, by using (2.1) with $s=3$ we get first

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi\nabla p_{h,B}\|^3_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho)} &= c\left(\int_{B_\rho}\phi^{\frac{18}{5}}|\nabla p_{h,B}|^{\frac{18}{5}}dx\right)^{\frac{5}{6}} \le c\left(\int_{B_\rho}\phi^6|\nabla p_{h,B}|^6dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-3}\left(\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla p_{h,B}|^2dx\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\rho + c\left(\int_{B_\rho}\phi^2|\nabla^2 p_{h,B}|^2dx\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\rho\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-3}\left(\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla p_{h,B}|^2dx\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\rho, \qquad (2.10)\end{aligned}$$

from which, integrating it over I_ρ, we obtain

$$\|\phi\nabla p_{h,B}\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho))} \le \rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho-r)^{-2}c\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)}.$$

Using this estimate, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi u\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho))} &\le 2\|\phi v_B\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho))} + 2\|\phi\nabla p_{h,B}\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho))}\\ &\le 2\|\phi v_B\|^2_{L^3(I_\rho;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_\rho))} + c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho-r)^{-2}c\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)}. \qquad (2.11)\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.9) with (2.11), we arrive at

$$\|u\|^2_{L^3(I_r;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_r))} \le c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho-r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + (\rho-r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + \frac{1}{8}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}. \qquad (2.12)$$

Once more using the fact that $p_{h,B}$ is harmonic applying integration by parts, Caccioppoli type inequality together (2.1), we evaluate for almost all $t\in I_\rho$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi(t)\nabla u(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} &= \int_{B_\rho}|\nabla v_B(t)|^2\phi^2(t)dx + \int_{B_\rho}(\nabla v_B(t)+\nabla u(t)) : (\nabla v_B(t)-\nabla u(t))\phi^2(t)dx\\ &= \int_{B_\rho}|\nabla v_B(t)|^2\phi^2(t)dx + \int_{B_\rho}(\nabla v_B(t)+\nabla u(t)) : \nabla^2 p_{h,B}\phi^2(t)dx\\ &= \int_{B_\rho}|\nabla v_B(t)|^2\phi^2(t)dx - \int_{B_\rho}(v_B(t)+u(t))\otimes\nabla\phi^2(t) : \nabla^2 p_{h,B}dx\\ &\le \|\phi(t)\nabla v_B(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} + c(\rho-r)^{-2}\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)}.\end{aligned}$$

Integration of both side of the above inequality together with Hölder's inequality gives

$$\|\phi\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \le \|\phi\nabla v_B\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} + c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho-r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)}. \qquad (2.13)$$

Combining (2.8) with (2.13) we are led to

$$\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_r)} \le c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho-r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + (\rho-r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)} + \frac{1}{4}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}. \qquad (2.14)$$

Thus, adding (2.12) to (2.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\|^2_{L^3(I_r;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_r))}+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_r)}\\&\qquad\le c\rho^{\frac{5}{3}}(\rho-r)^{-2}\|u\|^2_{L^3(Q_\rho)}+(\rho-r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)}+\frac{3}{8}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.15}$$

Let $t\in I_\rho$ be chosen so that $u(t)\in W^{1,2}(B_\rho)$. Applying Hölder's inequality together with Poincaré-Sobolev's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(t)\|^3_{L^3(B_\rho)}&\le\|u(t)\|^{\frac{3q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_\rho)}\|u(t)\|^{2\frac{9-3q}{6-q}}_{L^6(B_\rho)}\\&\le c\|u(t)\|^{\frac{3q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_\rho)}\|\nabla u(t)\|^{2\frac{9-3q}{6-q}}_{L^2(B_\rho)}+c\rho^{\frac{3q-9}{q}}\|u(t)\|^3_{L^q(B_\rho)}.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating this inequality over I_ρ, and applying Hölder's inequality, we are led to

$$\|u\|^3_{L^3(Q_\rho)}\le c\|u\|^{\frac{3q}{6-q}}_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_\rho;L^q(B_\rho))}\|\nabla u\|^{2\frac{9-3q}{6-q}}_{L^2(Q_\rho)}+c\rho^{\frac{q-3}{q}}\|u\|^3_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_\rho;L^q(B_\rho))}.\tag{2.16}$$

We now estimate the right-hand side of (2.15) by the aid of (2.16), and applying Young's inequality. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\|^2_{L^3(I_r;L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_r))}+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_r)}\\&\quad\le c\rho^{\frac{30-5q}{3q}}(\rho-r)^{\frac{2q-12}{q}}\|u\|^2_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_\rho;L^q(B_\rho))}+c(\rho-r)^{-\frac{6-q}{2q-3}}\|u\|^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_\rho;L^q(B_\rho))}\\&\qquad+c\rho^{\frac{q-3}{q}}(\rho-r)^{-1}\|u\|^3_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_\rho;L^q(B_\rho))}+\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.17}$$

By using a standard iteration argument (e.g. see [4]) we deduce from (2.17) together with Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\|^2_{L^3(I_{\frac{3}{4}R};L^{\frac{18}{5}}(B_{\frac{3}{4}R}))}+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(Q_{\frac{3}{4}R})}\\&\quad\le cR^{\frac{q-6}{3q}}\|u\|^2_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_R;L^q(B_R))}+cR^{-\frac{6-q}{2q-3}}\|u\|^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}_{L^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}(I_R;L^q(B_R))}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.18}$$

Multiplying both sides of (2.18) by R^{-1}, and applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain the desired inequality (2.7). ∎

We continue our discussion with some useful iteration lemmas. Let $G\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded C^2-domain. By $A^s(G)$, $1<s<+\infty$, we denote the image of $W^{2,s}_0(G)$ under the Laplacian Δ, which is a closed subspace of $L^s(G)$. By $B^s(G)$ we denote the complementary space, which contains all $p\in L^s(\Omega)$ being harmonic in G such that

$$L^s(G)=A^s(G)+B^s(G).\tag{2.19}$$

By using the well-known Calderón-Zygmund inequality, and the elliptic regularity of the Bi-harmonic equation we get the following

Lemma 2.7. *1. Let $A \in L^s(G;\mathbb{R}^{n^2})$. Then there exists a unique $p_0 \in A^s(G)$ such that*

$$-\Delta p_0 = \partial_i \partial_j A_{ij} \quad \text{in} \quad G \tag{2.20}$$

in the sense of distributions [1)]. *In addition, it holds*

$$\|p_0\|_s \lesssim \|A\|_s. \tag{2.21}$$

2. Let $h \in L^s(G;\mathbb{R}^n)$, $1 \le s < n$. Then there exists a unique $p_0 \in A^{s^*}(G) \cap W^{1,s}(G)$ such that

$$-\Delta p_0 = \partial_i h_i \quad \text{in} \quad G$$

in the sense of distributions, and the following estimate holds true

$$\|p_0\|_{s^*} + \|\nabla p_0\|_s \lesssim \|h\|_s. \tag{2.22}$$

The hidden constants in both (2.21) and (2.22) depend only on s, n, and the geometric property of G. In case G equals a ball, these constants are independent of the radius.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $f \in L^{\frac{3}{2}}(Q_1)$. Let $0 < r_0 < 1$. Suppose, there exists $4 \le \lambda \le 5$ and $C > 0$, such that for all $z_0 = (x_0, t_0) \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $r_0 \le r \le \frac{1}{2}$*

$$\int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |f - \tilde{f}_{B_r(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \le K_0 r^\lambda, \tag{2.23}$$

where $\tilde{f}_{B_r}(t) = \fint_{B_r} f(x,t)dx$. Let $\nabla p = E^*_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}}(\nabla \cdot f)$. Then for all $z_0 \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $r_0 \le r \le \frac{1}{4}$ it holds

$$\int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |p - \tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \le C K_0 r^4. \tag{2.24}$$

Proof: Let $z_0 \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $r_0 \le r \le \frac{1}{8}$ be arbitrarily chosen, but fixed. Let $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$, specified below. According to (2.19) there exist unique $p_{0,r}(t) \in A^{\frac{3}{2}}(B_r(x_0))$ and $p_{h,r}(t) \in B^{\frac{3}{2}}(B_r(x_0))$ such that $p(t) - \tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}(t) = p_{0,r}(t) + p_{h,r}(t)$. Noting that $p(t) - \tilde{p}_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)}(t) = p(t) - \tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}(t) - (p(t) - \tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}(t))_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)} |p(t) - \tilde{p}_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)}(t)|^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&\quad\lesssim \int\limits_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)} |p_{h,r}(t) - (p_{h,r}(t))_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} + \int\limits_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)} |p_{0,r}(t) - (p_{0,r}(t))_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&\quad\lesssim \theta^{\frac{9}{2}} \int\limits_{B_r(x_0)} |p_{h,r}(t)|^{\frac{3}{2}} + \int\limits_{B_r(x_0)} |f(t) - \tilde{f}_{B_r(x_0)}(t)|^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&\quad\lesssim \theta^{\frac{9}{2}} \int\limits_{B_r(x_0)} |p(t) - \tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}(t)|^{\frac{3}{2}} + \int\limits_{B_r(x_0)} |f(t) - \tilde{f}_{B_r(x_0)}(t)|^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

[1)] Here (2.20) means $-\int\limits_G p_0 \Delta \phi = \int\limits_G A_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \phi$ for all $\phi \in C^\infty_c(G)$.

Integrating the above estimate over $I_{\theta r}(t_0)$, and observing the assumption (2.22), we arrive at

$$\int\limits_{Q_{\theta r}(z_0)} |p-\tilde{p}_{B_{\theta r}(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq C_1\theta^{\frac{9}{2}} \int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |p-\tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} + C_2K_0r^4. \tag{2.25}$$

By a standard iteration argument from (2.25) we deduce that

$$\int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |p-\tilde{p}_{B_r(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \lesssim r^4 \int\limits_{Q_{\frac{1}{4}}(z_0)} |p|^{\frac{3}{2}} + K_0r^4. \tag{2.26}$$

Noting that by the definition of p having for almost every $t \in I_{\frac{1}{4}}(t_0)$

$$\|p(t)\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}(B_{\frac{1}{4}}(x_0))} \leq c\|f(t)-\tilde{f}_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}}(t)\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}(B_{\frac{3}{4}})},$$

the assertion (2.24) follows from (2.26) together with (2.22). ∎

We are in a position to prove the following iteration lemma, based on the idea of [1].

Proposition 2.9. *Let $u \in V^2(Q_1(0,0))$ be a local suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations. We define $v = u+\nabla p_h$, where $\nabla p_h = -E^*_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}}(u)$. There exist absolute positive numbers K_q and ε_q such that if*

$$A_q(1,0) \leq \varepsilon_q \tag{2.27}$$

then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 2$, and for all $z_0 \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(0,0)$ it holds

$$⨍_{Q_{r_n}(z_0)} |v|^3 dxdt \leq K_q^3 A_q(1,0)^3, \tag{2.23}$$

where $r_n = 2^{-n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: From the definition of a local suitable weak solution the following local energy inequality holds true for every non negative $\phi \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}\Big(B_{\frac{3}{4}} \times \Big(-\frac{9}{16}, 0\Big]\Big)$, and for almost

all $t \in \Big(-\frac{9}{16}, 0\Big]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int |v(t)|^2\phi(t)dx + \int_{-r_3^2}^{t}\int |\nabla v|^2\phi dxds \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{2}\int_{-r_3^2}^{t}\int |v|^2\Big(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} + \Delta\phi\Big)dxds + \frac{1}{2}\int_{-r_3^2}^{t}\int |v|^2 v\cdot\nabla\phi - |v|^2\nabla p_h\cdot\nabla\phi dxds \\
&\qquad + \int_{-r_3^2}^{t}\int (v\otimes v - v\otimes\nabla p_h : \nabla^2 p_h)\phi dxds + \int_{-r_3^2}^{t}\int p_1 v\cdot\nabla\phi dxds \\
&\qquad + \int_{-r_3^2}^{t}\int p_2 v\cdot\nabla\phi dxds. \qquad (2.24)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nabla p_1 = E^*_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}}(\Delta u), \quad \nabla p_2 = -E^*_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}}(\nabla\cdot(u\otimes u)),$$

Note that by the definition of v it holds almost everywhere in $Q_{\frac{3}{4}}(0,0)$

$$u\otimes u = v\otimes v - v\otimes\nabla p_h - \nabla p_h\otimes v + \nabla p_h\otimes\nabla p_h. \qquad (2.25)$$

Proof of (2.23)$_n$ by induction: For $n = 2$ the inequality $(2.23)_2$ follows immediately from Lemma 2.6.

Let $K_q > 1$ be a constant specified below. Assume $(2.23)_k$ is true for $k = 1, \dots, n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies for all $z_0 \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(0,0)$ and $r_n \le r \le \frac{1}{2}$

$$⨍_{Q_r(z_0)} |v|^3 dxdt \le CK_q^3 A_q(1,0)^3. \qquad (2.26)$$

Let $r_{n+1} \le r \le r_3$ and $z_0 \in Q_{\frac{1}{4}}(0,0)$ be arbitrarily chosen, but fixed. Using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, (2.26), and recalling that p_h is harmonic, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
⨍_{Q_r(z_0)} |v|^{\frac{3}{2}}|\nabla p_h|^{\frac{3}{2}} dxdt &\le CK_q^{\frac{3}{2}} A_q(1,0)^{\frac{3}{2}} r^{-1}\left[\int_{I_1}\Big(\int_{B_{\frac{1}{4}}(x_0)} |\nabla p_h(t)|^q dx\Big)^{\frac{3}{q}} dt\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le CK_q^{\frac{3}{2}} A_q(1,0)^{\frac{3}{2}} r^{-1}\left[\int_{I_1} \|u(t)\|^3_{L^q(B_1)} dt\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le Cr^{-1}K_q^{\frac{3}{2}} A_q(1,0)^3. \qquad (2.27)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, applying Poincaré's inequality, and employing Lemma 2.6, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_{Q_r(z_0)} |\nabla p_h \otimes \nabla p_h - (\widetilde{\nabla p_h \otimes \nabla p_h})_{B_r}|^{\frac{3}{2}} dxdt \\
&\qquad \le Cr^{-5+\frac{3}{2}} \int_{Q_r(z_0)} |\nabla p_h|^{\frac{3}{2}} |\nabla^2 p_h|^{\frac{3}{2}} \le Cr^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int\limits_{Q_{\frac{3}{4}}} |\nabla p_h|^3 \\
&\qquad \le Cr^{-\frac{1}{2}} A_q(1,0)^3. \qquad (2.28)
\end{aligned}$$

By the aid of (2.26), (2.27) and (2.28) together with (2.25) we obtain for all $r_{n+1} \le r \le 1$

$$\int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |u \otimes u - (\widetilde{u \otimes u})_{B_r(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \le CK_q^3 A_q(1,0)^3 r^4.$$

Applying the Lemma 2.8, we find that for all $r_{n+1} \le r \le r_2$

$$\int\limits_{Q_r(z_0)} |p_2 - (\tilde{p}_2)_{B_r(x_0)}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \le CK_q^3 A_q(1,0)^3 r^4. \qquad (2.29)$$

By Ψ_{n+1} we denote the fundamental solution of the backward heat equation having its singularity at $(x_0, t_0 + r_{n+1}^2)$, more precisely,

$$\Psi_{n+1}(x,t) = \frac{c_0}{(r_{n+1}^2 - t + t_0)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp\Big\{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{(r_{n+1}^2 - t + t_0)}\Big\}, \quad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, t_0 + r_{n+1}).$$

Taking a suitable cut off function $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $Q_{r_4}(z_0) \subset Q_{r_3}(z_0)$, we may insert $\phi = \Phi_{n+1} = \Psi_{n+1}\chi$ into the local energy inequality (2.24) to get for almost all $t \in (t_0 - r_3^2, t_0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} \Phi_{n+1}(t)|v(t)|^2 + \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} \Phi_{n+1} |\nabla v|^2 \\
&\quad \le \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} |v|^2 \Big(\frac{\partial \Phi_{n+1}}{\partial t} + \Delta \Phi_{n+1} \Big) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} |v|^2 v \cdot \nabla \Phi_{n+1} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} |v|^2 \nabla p_h \cdot \nabla \Phi_{n+1} + \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} (v \otimes v - v \otimes \nabla p_h : \nabla^2 p_h) \Phi_{n+1} \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} p_1 v \cdot \nabla \Phi_{n+1} + \int_{t_0 - r_3^2}^{t} \int\limits_{B_{r_3}(x_0)} p_2 v \cdot \nabla \Phi_{n+1}. \qquad (2.30)
\end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in [1], the above inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(t_0-r_{n+1}^2,t_0)} \fint_{B_{r_{n+1}}(x_0)} |v(t)|^2 + r_{n+1}^{-3} \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |\nabla v|^2 \\
&\quad\lesssim \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} |v|^2\Big|\frac{\partial\Phi_{n+1}}{\partial t} + \Delta\Phi_{n+1}\Big| + \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} |v|^3|\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| + \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} |v|^2|\nabla p_h||\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} |v|^2|\nabla^2 p_h|\Phi_{n+1} + \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} |v||\nabla p_h||\nabla^2 p_h|\Phi_{n+1} + \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} p_1 v\cdot\nabla\Phi_{n+1} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int\limits_{Q_{r_3}(z_0)} p_2 v\cdot\nabla\Phi_{n+1} \\
&\quad = I + II + III + IV + V + VI + VII. \qquad (2.31)
\end{aligned}$$

(i) Obviously, as $\left|\frac{\partial\Phi_{n+1}}{\partial t} + \Delta\Phi_{n+1}\right| \le C$ in $Q_{r_3}(z_0)$, and using (2.7), we see that

$$I \le C\|v\|^2_{L^3(Q_{r_3}(z_0))} \le CA_q(1,0)^2.$$

(ii) As $|\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| \le Cr_k^{-4}$ in $Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0)$ for all $k = 1,\dots,n$, observing $(2.23)_k$, and employing (2.30), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0)} |v|^3|\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| + \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |v|^3|\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| \\
&\le CK_q^3A_q(1,0)^3\sum_{k=2}^{n} r_k^{-4}r_k^5 \le CK_q^3A_q(1,0)^3.
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) Similarly as in (ii),

$$\begin{aligned}
III &= \sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0)} |v|^2|\nabla p_h||\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| + \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |v|^2|\nabla p_h||\nabla\Phi_{n+1}| \\
&\le CK_q^2A_q(1,0)^3\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_k^{-4}r_k^{\frac{13}{3}} \le CK_q^3A_q(1,0)^3.
\end{aligned}$$

(iv) As $\Phi_{n+1} \le Cr_k^{-3}$ in $Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0)$ for all $k = 1,\dots,n+1$ together with $(2.23)_k$ and (2.30) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
IV &= \sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0)} |v|^2|\nabla^2 p_h|\Phi_{n+1} + \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |v|^2|\nabla^2 p_h||\Phi_{n+1}| \\
&\le CK_q^2A_q(1,0)^3\sum_{k=2}^{n} r_k^{-3}r_k^{\frac{13}{3}} \le CK_q^3A_q(1,0)^3.
\end{aligned}$$

(v) Similarly as in (vi) we estimate

$$V = \sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0)} |v||\nabla p_h||\nabla^2 p_h|\Phi_{n+1} + \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |v||\nabla p_h||\nabla^2 p_h|\Phi_{n+1}$$
$$\leq CK_q A_q(1,0)^3 \sum_{k=2}^{n} r_k^{-3} r_k^{\frac{11}{3}} \leq CK_q^3 A_q(1,0)^3.$$

(vi) To estimate VI we argue as in [1]. Let χ_k denote cut off functions, suitable for $Q_{r_{k+1}}(z_0) \subset Q_{r_k}(z_0)$, $k = 2, \ldots, n+1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
VI &= \int\limits_{Q_{r_2}(z_0)} p_1 v \cdot \nabla \Phi_{n+1} \\
&= \sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+2}}(z_0)} p_1 v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(\chi_k - \chi_{k+1})) \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_{Q_{r_2}(z_0)} p_1 v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(1-\chi_2)) + \int\limits_{Q_{r_2}(z_0)} p_1 v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}\chi_{n+1}) \\
&= \sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+2}}(z_0)} (p_1 - (\tilde{p}_1)_{B_{r_k}(x_0)}) v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(\chi_k - \chi_{k+1})) \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_{Q_{r_2}(z_0)} p_1 v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(1-\chi_2)) \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} (p_1 - (\tilde{p}_1)_{B_{r_{n+1}}(x_0)}) v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}\chi_{n+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

As $|\nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(\chi_k - \chi_{k+1}))| \leq C r_k^{-4}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$, applying Poincaré's inequality, using the fact that p_1 is harmonic, together with $(2.23)_k$ and (2.7) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+2}}(z_0)} (p_1 - (\tilde{p}_1)_{B_{r_k}(x_0)}) v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(\chi_k - \chi_{k+1})) \\
&\qquad \leq CK_q A_q(1,0) r_k^{-4} r_k^5 \Big(\int\limits_{Q_{1/2}} p_1^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\qquad \leq CK_q (A_q(1,0)^2 + A_q(1,0)^{\frac{3q}{2q-3}}) r_k \\
&\qquad \leq CK_q A_q(1,0)^2 r_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Summation from $k = 3$ to n yields

$$\sum_{k=3}^{n} \int\limits_{Q_{r_k}(z_0)\setminus Q_{r_{k+2}}(z_0)} (p_1 - (\tilde{p}_1)_{B_{r_k}(x_0)}) v \cdot \nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(\chi_k - \chi_{k+1})) \lesssim CK_q A(1,0)^2.$$

Similarly, we find

$$\int\limits_{Q_{r_2}(z_0)} p_1 v\cdot\nabla(\Phi_{n+1}(1-\chi_2)) - \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} (p_1-(\tilde{p}_1)_{B_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)})v\cdot\nabla(\Phi_{n+1}\chi_{n+1}))$$
$$\leq (1+r_{n+1})CK_qA_q(1,0)^2.$$

Thus,

$$VI \leq CK_qA_q(1,0)^2.$$

(vii) Finally, arguing as in (vi), and making use of (2.29), we estimate

$$VII \leq CK_q^3A_q^3(1,0).$$

Thus, inserting the estimates of I, II, III, IV, V, VI and VII into the right-hand side of (2.31), we get a constant $C_q > 0$ independently of n, such that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(t_0-r_{n+1}^2,t_0)} \fint_{B_{r_{n+1}}(x_0)} |v(t)|^2 + r_{n+1}^{-3} \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |\nabla v|^2$$
$$\leq C_q\Big(K_q^3A_q(1,0)^3 + K_qA_q(1,0)^2\Big) = \Big(C_qK_qA_q(1,0) + \frac{C_q}{K_q}\Big)K_q^2A_q(1,0)^2. \tag{2.32}$$

Note that $C_q \to +\infty$ as $q \to \frac{3}{2}$.

On the other hand, using a standard interpolation argument along with (2.32), we arrive at

$$\fint_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |v|^3 \leq C_0\bigg[\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(t_0-r_{n+1}^2,t_0)} \fint_{B_{r_{n+1}}(x_0)} |v(t)|^2 + r_{n+1}^{-3} \int\limits_{Q_{r_{n+1}}(z_0)} |\nabla v|^2\bigg]^{\frac{3}{2}}$$
$$\leq \Big(C_0C_qK_qA_q(1,0) + \frac{C_0C_q}{K_q}\Big)^{\frac{3}{2}}K_q^2A_q(1,0)^2 \tag{2.33}$$

with an absolute constant $C_0 > 1$. Note that neither C_q nor C_0 depend on the choice of K_q. Thus we may set

$$K_q = 2C_qC_0, \qquad \varepsilon_q = \frac{1}{4C_q^2C_0^2}.$$

Accordingly, if $A_q(1,0) \leq \varepsilon_q$, (2.33) implies

$$\fint_{Q^{n+1}(z_0)} |v|^3 \leq K_q^3A_q(1,0)^3.$$

Whence, by induction the assertion of the proposition is true. ∎

Proof of Theorem 2.5: Proposition 2.9 implies for every Lebesgue point $z_0 = (x_0,t_0) \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(0,0)$ of $|v|^3$, after letting $n \to +\infty$ in $(2.23)_n$, that the estimate following holds true

$$|v(x_0,t_0)| \leq K_qA_q(1,0). \tag{2.34}$$

By using the triangular inequality and the mean value property of harmonic functions, we get from (2.34) for almost all $(x,t) \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(0,0)$

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x,t)| \le K_q A_q(1,0) + |\nabla p_h(x,t)| &\le K_q A_q(1,0) + c\|u(t)\|_{L^q(B_1)}. \\ &\le (K_q + c) A_q(1,0). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\frac{1}{2}})} \le c(K_q+1) \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in I_1} \|u(t)\|_{L^q(B_1)} = c(K_q+1) A_q(1,0). \tag{2.35}$$

Finally the assertion (2.6) follows from (2.35) respectively by using a routine scaling argument. ∎

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be fixed. Let $0 < r \le 1$ be arbitrarily chosen. By means of Hölder's inequality, Sobolev's inequality and (A.1) (cf. Lemma A.1) we get

$$r^{-2} \int\limits_{B_r(y_0)} |U|^2 dy \le C \int\limits_{B_1(y_0)} |U|^2 + |\nabla U|^2 dy \le C\Big(\|U\|^2_{L^q(B_1(y_0))} + \|\Omega\|^2_{L^2(B_1(y_0))} \Big). \tag{3.1}$$

This implies for any $1 \le s_0 \le \sqrt{1+2a}$

$$r^{-2} \int\limits_{B_r(\frac{y_0}{s_0})} |U|^2 dy \le C \sup_{1\le s\le \sqrt{1+2a}} \Big(\|U\|^2_{L^q(B_1(\frac{y_0}{s}))} + \|\Omega\|^2_{L^2(B_1(\frac{y_0}{s}))} \Big) =: C\Psi(y_0). \tag{3.2}$$

Recalling the definition of u, and using (3.2), we get for almost all $t \in \Big(-\frac{1}{2a}-1, -\frac{1}{2a}\Big)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int\limits_{B_r(y_0)} |u(x,t)|^2 dx &= \frac{1}{-2at} \int\limits_{B_r(y_0)} \Big| U\Big(\frac{x}{\sqrt{-2at}}\Big)\Big|^2 dx \\ &= \sqrt{-2at} \int\limits_{B_{\frac{r}{\sqrt{-2at}}}(\frac{y_0}{\sqrt{-2at}})} |U|^2 dy \\ &\le \sqrt{1+2a} \int\limits_{B_r(\frac{y_0}{\sqrt{-2at}})} |U|^2 dy \le C_0 r^2 \Psi(y_0), \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, setting $z_0 = \Big(y_0, -\frac{1}{2a}\Big)$, the above estimate becomes

$$A_2(r, z_0)^2 \le C_0 r \Psi(y_0). \tag{3.3}$$

We take

$$r = \min\left\{1, \frac{\varepsilon_2^2}{C_0 \Psi(y_0)}\right\}.$$

where ε_2 denotes the constant in Theorem 2.5 for the case $q = 2$. By the choice of r we infer from (3.3)

$$A_2(r, z_0) \le \varepsilon_2. \tag{3.4}$$

Accordingly, Theorem 2.5 together with (3.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |U(y_0)| &\le \sup_{Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(z_0)} |u| \le C_2 r^{-1} A_2(r, z_0) \le C_2 C_0^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Psi(y_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le C_2(\varepsilon_2^{-1}\Psi(y_0) + C_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Psi(y_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

By the assumption (1.6) having $\Psi(y_0) = \mathrm{o}(|y_0|)$, it follows from (3.5) that U has sublinear growth. Furthermore, appealing to Lemma A.2, we see that $|P(y)| = O(|y|^{\frac{9}{2}})$ which allows to apply the maximum principle for the energy function $\Pi = \frac{|U|^2}{2} + P + ay \cdot U$. Hence, $\Pi = \Pi_0 = \text{const}$ (cf. Lemma 5.1[8]). Thus, applying the formula

$$-\Delta\Pi + (U + ay) \cdot \nabla\Pi = -|\Omega|^2, \quad \Omega = \nabla \times U,$$

we see that $\Omega = 0$. Combining this with the condition $\nabla \cdot U = 0$, we find that each component U_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, is harmonic. Since U has sublinear growth at infinity, we get $U = \text{const}$.

■

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be fixed. Let $\alpha > 0$ be chosen so that (1.8) holds true. Recalling the definition of u, we get for any $0 < r \le 1$ and for almost all $t \in \Big(-\frac{1}{2a} - 1, -\frac{1}{2a}\Big)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int\limits_{B_r(y_0)} |u(x,t)|^q dx \\ &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{-2at})^q} \int\limits_{B_r(y_0)} \Big|U\Big(\frac{x}{\sqrt{-2at}}\Big)\Big|^q dx \\ &= (\sqrt{-2at})^{3-q} \int\limits_{B_{\frac{r}{\sqrt{-2at}}}(\frac{y_0}{\sqrt{-2at}})} |U|^q dy \\ &\le \alpha^q \,\mathrm{meas}(B_1) r^3 + (1+2a)^{\frac{3-q}{2}} \int\limits_{B_r(\frac{y_0}{\sqrt{-2at}}) \cap \{|U| > \alpha\}} |U|^q dy \\ &= C_0 r^3 + \tilde{\Phi}(y_0), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where we set $\tilde{\Phi}(y_0) = (1+2a)^{\frac{3-q}{2}} \sup_{1 \le s \le \sqrt{1+2a}} \|U\|^q_{L^q(B_1(\frac{y_0}{s}))}$ and $C_0 = \alpha^q \,\mathrm{meas}(B_1)$. Setting $z_0 = \Big(y_0, -\frac{1}{2a}\Big)$ from the inequality above, we deduce that

$$A_q(r, z_0)^q = \sup_{t \in (-\frac{1}{2a} - r^2, -\frac{1}{2a})} \|u(t)\|^q_{L^q(B_1(y_0))} \le C_0 r^q + r^{q-3}\tilde{\Phi}(y_0). \tag{4.2}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $C_0 > 1$. We now take r such that

$$C_0 r^q = \frac{\varepsilon_q^q}{2}, \tag{4.3}$$

where ε_q denotes the positive number in Theorem 2.5. On the other hand, our assumption (1.7) yields $\tilde{\Phi}(y_0) \to 0$ as $|y_0| \to +\infty$. Therefore, we may chose $R > 0$ such that for all $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R$

$$r^{q-3}\tilde{\Phi}(y_0) \le \frac{\varepsilon_q^q}{2},$$

Accordingly, Theorem 2.5 implies for all $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R$

$$|U(y_0)| \le \sup_{Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(z_0)} |u| \le C_q r^{-1} A_q(r, z_0) \le C_q r^{-1} \varepsilon_q. \tag{4.4}$$

Therefore U is bounded. According to Tsai's result (cf. Lemma 5.1[8]), we conclude that $U = \text{const}$. This completes the proof of the theorem. ∎

5 Proof of Theorem 1.5

As in [2] we consider the self-similar transform of the solution (u, p) of (1.1) into (U, Π) by

$$u(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a(t_* - t)}} V(y,s), \quad p(x,t) = \frac{1}{2a(t_* - t)} \Pi(y,s),$$

where

$$y = \frac{x - x_*}{\sqrt{2a(t_* - t)}}, \quad s = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{t_*}{t_* - t}\right).$$

Then, the system (1.1) is transformed into a system for $(V, \Pi) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, \infty))$

$$V_s - \Delta V + (V \cdot \nabla)V + ay \cdot \nabla V + aV = -\nabla \Pi, \qquad \nabla \cdot V = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{4.5}$$

The condition (1.9) is transformed into

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} \|V(\cdot, s) - U\|_{L^q\left(B_{\frac{r}{\sqrt{2a}}}(0)\right)} = 0 \quad \forall r > 0. \tag{4.6}$$

From the argument of Proof of [2, Theorem 1.2]) one can show from (4.6) that U is a solution of (1.4) for a scalar function P. We include this part here for reader's convenience. We choose $\xi \in C_c^1(0,1)$ with $\int_0^1 \xi(s)ds = 1$, and $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\nabla \cdot \phi = 0$. Then, multiplying (4.5) by $\xi(s-n)\varphi(y)$ and integrating it over $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [n, n+1]$, then after integration by part we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi'(s)\varphi(y) \cdot V(y, s+n) dy ds + \frac{a}{2} \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi(s) V(y, s+n) \cdot \varphi(y) dy ds \\
&\quad = -\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi(s)(V \otimes V)(y, s+n) : \nabla \varphi(y) dy ds \\
&\quad\quad - \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \xi(s) \left\{ aV(y, s+n) \cdot (y \cdot \nabla)\varphi - V(y, s+n) \cdot \Delta \varphi \right\} dy ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since (4.6) implies that $V(\cdot, s+n) \to U$ in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as $n \to \infty$, passing $n \to \infty$ in (4.7), using the fact $\int_0^1 \xi(s)ds = 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \varphi(y)\cdot U dy &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (U\otimes U)(y) : \nabla\varphi(y) dy \\ &\quad -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \{aU(y)\cdot(y\cdot\nabla)\varphi - U(y)\cdot\Delta\varphi\}\, dy, \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

which shows that $U \in L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is a weak solution of (1.4) for some scalar function $P = P(y)$. By a standard regularity theory (U, P) is a smooth solution of (1.4). Now, applying Corollary 1.4 one can conclude that $U = 0$, and the condition (1.9) reduces to

$$\lim_{t\to t_*} (t_* - t)^{\frac{q-3}{2q}} \sup_{t<\tau<t_*} \|u(\cdot,\tau)\|_{L^q(B_{r\sqrt{t_*-t}}(x_*))} = 0 \tag{4.9}$$

for each $r > 0$. Setting $r = 1$, $\rho = \sqrt{t_* - t}$, we find that

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0}\left\{ \rho^{\frac{q-3}{q}} \sup_{t_*-\rho^2<\tau<t_*} \|u(\cdot,\tau)\|_{L^q(B(x_*,\rho))} \right\} = \lim_{\rho\to 0} A_q(z_*,\rho) = 0,$$

where $z_* = (x_*, t_*)$. Thanks to Theorem 2.5 we find that z_* is a regular point (cf. also the regularity criterion due to Gustafson, Kang and Tsai [5, Theorem 1.1]). ∎

Acknowledgements

Chae was partially supported by NRF grants 2016R1A2B3011647, while Wolf has been supported supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the project WO1988/1-1; 612414.

A Gradient estimates and pressure estimate

Lemma A.1. *Let $U \in L^q_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $0 < q < +\infty$, with $\nabla\cdot U = 0$. Let $\Omega = \nabla\times U \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then $\nabla u \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and there holds for all $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$*

$$\|U\|_{L^2(B_1(y_0))} + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2(B_1(y_0))} \lesssim \|U\|_{L^q(B_2(y_0))} + \|\Omega\|_{L^2(B_2(y_0))}, \tag{A.1}$$

where the hidden constant depends only on q.

Proof: By means of a standard mollifying argument it suffice to verify the estimate (A.1) for smooth U.

Let $\alpha = \frac{6-q}{2q}$. For $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ let $\zeta \in C^\infty_{\rm c}(B_2(y_0))$ denote a suitable cut off function for

$B_1(y_0) \subset B_2(y_0)$. Using integration by parts, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\nabla U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha} dx &= \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} \nabla U : \nabla U \zeta^{2\alpha} dx \\
&= -\int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} U \cdot \Delta U \zeta^{2\alpha} dx - \alpha \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} \nabla |U|^2 \cdot \zeta^{2\alpha-1} \nabla \zeta dx \\
&= \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} U \cdot \nabla \times \Omega \zeta^{2\alpha} dx + \alpha \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha-1} \Delta \zeta dx \\
&\qquad + \alpha(2\alpha-1) \int\limits_{B} |U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha-2} |\nabla \zeta|^2 dx. \\
&= \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\Omega|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha} dx - 2\alpha \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} \Omega \cdot \zeta^{2\alpha-1} U \times \nabla \zeta dx \\
&\qquad + \alpha \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha-1} \Delta \zeta dx + \alpha(2\alpha-1) \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha-2} |\nabla \zeta|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Young's inequality, we get

$$\int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\nabla U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha} dx \lesssim \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\Omega|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha} dx + \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |U|^2 \zeta^{2\alpha-2} dx. \tag{A.2}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality along with Sobolev's inequality we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|U\zeta^{\alpha-1}\|^2_{L^2(B_2(y_0))} \\
&\quad \le \|U\|^{\frac{4q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_2(y_0))} \|U\zeta^{(\alpha-1)\frac{6-q}{6-3q}}\|^{\frac{12-6q}{6-q}}_{L^6(B_2(y_0))} = \|U\|^{\frac{4q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_2(y_0))} \|U\zeta^{\alpha}\|^{\frac{12-6q}{6-q}}_{L^6(B_2(y_0))} \\
&\quad \lesssim \|U\|^{\frac{4q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_2(y_0))} \|\nabla U\zeta^{\alpha}\|^{\frac{12-6q}{6-q}}_{L^2(B_2(y_0))} + \|U\|^{\frac{4q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_2(y_0))} \|U\zeta^{\alpha-1}\|^{\frac{12-6q}{6-q}}_{L^2(B_2(y_0))} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Young's inequality, we are led to

$$\|U\zeta^{\alpha-1}\|^2_{L^2(B_2(y_0))} \lesssim \|U\|^{\frac{4q}{6-q}}_{L^q(B_2(y_0))} \|\nabla U\zeta^{\alpha}\|^{\frac{12-6q}{6-q}}_{L^2(B_2(y_0))} + \|U\|^2_{L^q(B_2(y_0))}. \tag{A.3}$$

Combining (A.2) and (A.3), and using once more Young's inequality, we obtain (A.1). ∎

Lemma A.2. *Let (U, P) be a smooth solution to (1.4). Assume that $|U(y)| = O(|y|)$, and $\|\nabla U\|_{L^2(B_1(y))} = O(|y|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ as $|y| \to \infty$. Then, we have*

$$\|\nabla^k U\|_{L^2(B_1(y))} = O(|y|^{\frac{2k-1}{2}}), \tag{A.4}$$

$$|\nabla^k U(y)| = O(|y|^{\frac{2k+3}{2}}), \tag{A.5}$$

$$|P(y)| = O(|y|^{\frac{9}{2}}) \tag{A.6}$$

as $|y| \to \infty$.

Proof: Appying $\nabla\times$ to both sides of (1.4), we obtain

$$-\Delta\Omega + \nabla \times ((U \cdot \nabla)U) + ay \cdot \nabla\Omega + 2a\Omega = 0. \tag{A.7}$$

Let $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and let $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_2(y_0))$ denote a suitable cut off function for $B_1(y_0) \subset B_2(y_0)$. Multiplying (A.7) by $\Omega\zeta^2$, and applying integration by parts, using the formula $U \cdot \nabla U = \frac{1}{2}\nabla|U|^2 + \Omega \times U$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\nabla\Omega|^2\zeta^2 + \frac{a}{2}|\Omega|^2\zeta^2 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\Omega|^2(\Delta\zeta^2 + ay \cdot \nabla\zeta^2)dx - \int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} \Omega \times U \cdot \nabla \times (\Omega\zeta^2)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and Young's inequality, we find

$$\int\limits_{B_2(y_0)} |\nabla\Omega|^2\zeta^2 + 2a|\Omega|^2\zeta^2 dx \leq C(1 + |y_0| + |y_0|^3). \tag{A.9}$$

With the aid of Lemma A.1 together with Sobolev's inequality we infer from (A.9)

$$\|\nabla^2 U\|_{L^2(B_1(y_0))} + \|\nabla U\|_{L^6(B_1(y_0))} \leq C(1 + |y_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}). \tag{A.10}$$

Differentiating (A.1), arguing as above together, and applying an inductive argument, we see that

$$\|\nabla^k U\|_{L^2(B_1(y_0))} + \|\nabla^{k-1} U\|_{L^6(B_1(y_0))} \leq C(1 + |y_0|^{\frac{2k-1}{2}}). \tag{A.11}$$

Whence, (A.4). Employing Sobolev's embedding theorem, we get $H^{k+2}(B_1(y_0)) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(B_1(y_0))$. Thus (A.5) is an immediate consequence of (A.4) by using Sobolev's inequality.

Observing (1.4), and making use of (A.5), we obtain

$$|\nabla P(y)| = O(|y|^{\frac{7}{2}}). \tag{A.12}$$

This immediately implies (A.6). ∎

References

[1] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn and L. Nirenberg, *Partial Regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **35**, (1982), pp. 771-831.

[2] D. Chae, *Nonexistence of asymptotically self-similar singularities in the Euler and the Navier-Stokes equations,* Math. Ann. 238, (2007), pp. 435-449.

[3] G. Galdi, C. Simader and H. Sohr, *On the Stokes problem in Lipshitz domain,* Annali di Mat. Pura Appl., (IV), 167 (1994), pp. 147-163.

[4] M. Giaquinta, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems,*Ann. Math. Stud. No. 105, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton (1983).

[5] S. Gustafson, K. Kang and T.-P. Tsai, *Regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations near the boundary,* J. Diff. Eqns, 226, no. 2 (2006), pp. 594-618.

[6] J. Leray, *Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace,* Acta Math., 63 (1934), pp. 193-248.

[7] J. Nečas, M. Růžička and V. Šverak, *On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations,* Acta Math., 176 (1996), pp. 283-294.

[8] T.-P. Tsai, *On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-stokes equations satisfying local energy estimates,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 143 (1998), pp. 29-51.

[9] J. Wolf, *A new criterion for partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations,* Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics, A. S. R. Rannacher, ed. Springer, 2010, pp. 613-630.

[10] J. Wolf, *On the local regularity of suitable weak solutions to the generalized Navier-Stokes equations,* Ann. Univ. Ferrara, 61 (2015), pp. 149-171.

[11] J. Wolf, *On the local pressure of the Navier-Stokes equations and related systems,* to appear in Adv. Diff. Eqns., (2016).